



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

isters but never put into deeds, was real, it is due to history that the proof be forthcoming. If "it was not easy for Madison to feel that this free navigation of the Mississippi was so very important" (p. 63), why did he express his amazement to Monroe that the thought of surrendering it should even be entertained,¹ or why did he return to Congress (1786) mainly to defeat Jay's proposed treaty surrendering this right?² The statement that "the Spanish officials had withdrawn with all the stately circumstance that had surrounded them," probably refers only to their withdrawal from office, but is likely to mislead, since they lingered in Louisiana and fomented much trouble until finally ordered away. The author's treatment of Jefferson is similar to that of Mr. Henry Adams, whom he has read with care, though a little more favorable.

DAVID Y. THOMAS.

The Sectional Struggle. An Account of the Troubles Between the North and the South, from the Earliest Times to the Close of the Civil War. First Period Ending with the Compromise of 1833. Part concerning the Early Tariffs and Nullification. By CICERO W. HARRIS. (Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Co. 1902. Pp. 343.)

THE author of this work thinks that "the time has come when the more thoughtful people of both sections are ready to receive a full-length view of the long political and constitutional struggle between the North and the South." He has accordingly "devoted his spare time" to constructing such a work "from original sources . . . with infinite . . . care as to data and great catholicity in the handling of vexed questions." As announced in the title, the plan covers the entire field of sectionalism, but the author, for reasons not apparent, has seen fit to publish a part only, which has a decidedly fragmentary character. As it stands it is not a monograph dealing with the early tariff controversy, but a number of chapters from a larger work, whose unity is to be found only in the fact that they deal with struggles involving sectional feeling.

The scope of the work is narrow, being confined practically to tariff discussion in Congress. Four-fifths of the book is taken up with abstracts of debates, the rest being devoted to extremely brief statements of political events. Nothing is said about the economic conditions which caused the tariff controversy except in so far as these are referred to in southern speeches, and while the contents of every bill and amendment are given, there is nothing done by the author to explain the rates proposed or adopted. Even when votes are recorded no attempt is made to analyze them, nor is it shown in most cases to what extent sectionalism influenced the result. Political parties are seldom mentioned. In its very limited range the work seems to have been carefully and systematically carried out, being based apparently upon the *Annals of Congress* and Niles's *Register*. It is perhaps most useful in the chapters where

¹ June 26, 1786.

² Gay's *Madison*, 81 ff.

the nullification debates of 1830 and 1833 are summarized. Here the legal problems of constitutional interpretation are handled with a freedom not elsewhere observed.

In the brief narrative paragraphs no mistakes of any consequence have been noted, but there is nothing original in them, nor indeed is there in the whole book, unless it be a certain unusual freedom from sectional bias on the author's part. He differs from nearly all his predecessors and contemporaries, northern and southern, in condemning no one for his opinions. On the contrary he bestows praise upon all, reserving his nearest approaches to severity for Webster, Clay and Calhoun. In fact, this uniform laudation gives the work a curiously old-fashioned, high-polite air, which persists in spite of the presence of occasional words like "brainiest." No one of the political worthies of those days fails to receive due salutation. The membership of every Congress, convention or legislature is "eminent," "distinguished," or "illustrious"; speeches are invariably "logical and ingenious," "learned and argumentative," "notable," "subtle," "long and luminous," "elegant and impassioned," "powerful," or "tremendous." Yet if the book is to be welcomed for any one feature it is for holding such an appreciative attitude toward Lowndes, Hayne, McDuffie, Forsyth, Mallary, Cambrelong, Lawrence and others who, as the author says in the preface, "have seldom received their dues from historians." The men who did the real work in the earlier Congresses are by no means always those whose names appear most frequently in the pages of later writers. This feature apart, the book is in reality not so much history as a digest or summary of part of the material for the history of the tariff controversy.

T. C. SMITH.

The Life of Charles Robinson, the First State Governor of Kansas.

By FRANK W. BLACKMAR. (Topeka, Kansas: Crane and Co. 1902. Pp. 438.)

THE controversies over the early history of Kansas have revolved mainly about three men—John Brown, General Lane and Governor Robinson. The biographers of Brown were early in the field, Redpath being the pioneer among them with his sensational book published in 1860. Though newspaper sketches, like the rather interesting screeds of "Kicking-Bird," in *The Kansas City Times*, were not wanting, no formal life of Lane appeared until 1896, while that of Robinson was delayed until 1902.

Perhaps it would be hazardous to say that these Kansas controversies have been practically settled by the investigations and discussions of the last two decades, but certain points seem to be fairly established. It is evident that John Brown, who went to Kansas for the avowed purpose of fomenting the disturbances and precipitating a collision between the North and South, hindered the free-state movement in the territory, quite as much as he helped it; that Lane, with all his brilliant and attractive qualities, was rash and unscrupulous, and that Robinson repre-